



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

*fw*  
UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/020,335	12/12/2001	Edward O. Clapper	884.608US1	1740
21186	7590	02/22/2006	EXAMINER	
SCHWEGMAN, LUNDBERG, WOESSNER & KLUTH 1600 TCF TOWER 121 SOUTH EIGHT STREET MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55402				CUNNINGHAM, GREGORY F
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
		2676		

DATE MAILED: 02/22/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/020,335	CLAPPER, EDWARD O.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Gregory F. Cunningham	2676

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

#### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

- 1)  Responsive to communication(s) filed on 12 December 2005.
- 2a)  This action is FINAL. 2b)  This action is non-final.
- 3)  Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

- 4)  Claim(s) 1,3,4,7-46 and 48 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5)  Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6)  Claim(s) 1, 3, 4, 7-46 and 48 is/are rejected.
- 7)  Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8)  Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

- 9)  The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10)  The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11)  The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12)  Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  
a) All b) Some \* c) None of:
  1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### Attachment(s)

1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.	5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
	6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____

**DETAILED ACTION**

1. This action is responsive to communications of application received 12/12/2005.
2. The disposition of the claims is as follows: claims 1, 3, 4, 7-46 and 48 are pending in the application. Claims 1, 8, 15, 22 and 46 are independent claims. Claims 2, 5, 6, and 47 have been cancelled.
3. The group and/or Art Unit location of your application has changed. To aid in the correlation of any papers for this application, all further correspondence should be directed to Group Art Unit 2676 (effective 2/06). Please be sure to use the most current art unit number on all correspondence to help us route your case and respond to you in a timely fashion.
4. When making claim amendments, the applicant is encouraged to consider the references in their entireties, including those portions that have not been cited by the examiner and their equivalents as they may most broadly and appropriately apply to any particular anticipated claim amendments.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

5. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

6. Claims 1, 3 and 4 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being disclosed by Coteus et al. (US 5,537,476), hereinafter Coteus.

A. Coteus discloses claim 1, "A method comprising:

preparing data for display on a display, the data comprising at least one data attribute selected from the group consisting of font, paragraph, page, document, user name, user location, device name, time, style name, data type, text, field, file name, cell, size, shape, angular orientation, and position [in abstract and col. 2, Ins. 19-25 and Ins. 52-56, wherein 'Alternatively, two images could be formed with information in both, but when combined the information of either image is obscured, for example, in the case of text where each image can be in a different language' corresponds to "data attribute of font and/or text"];

modifying the data to form modified data, responsive to a value of the at least one data attribute [in abstract and col. 2, Ins. 19-25 and Ins. 52-56, wherein 'Alternatively, two images could be formed with information in both, but when combined the information of either image is obscured, for example, in the case of text where each image can be in a different language' corresponds to modifying data text; while 'wavelength shifted' corresponds to font and/or text color and therefore relates to modifying data attribute of font and/or text]; and

displaying the modified data on the display, wherein the modified data has a first degree of blur, a second degree of blur, no blur, or is illegible to a display user, wherein the degree of blur is varied in accordance with the at least one data attribute, and wherein the first and second degrees of blur have reduced legibility but are not illegible to the display user [in abstract and col. 2, Ins. 19-25 and Ins. 52-56, wherein "featureless image" and/or 'obscure' corresponds to "blur" or "illegible to a display user"]" [as detailed]

(Examiner's notes:

1. The “at least one data attribute selected from a group consisting of …” only requires one data attribute of the group to be shown as valid or asserted.
2. The combination of “a first degree of blur, a second degree of blur, no blur, or is illegible to a display user” makes use of the coordinating connective “or” and therefore only requires demonstration of any single one of said combination.
3. With regard to “illegible to a display user” and “reduced legibility but not illegible to the display user”; the specification seems drawn more toward ‘illegible to a display viewer other than the display user’.)

B. Coteus discloses claim 3, “The method recited in claim 1 and further comprising: unmodifying the modified data to form unmodified data; and displaying the unmodified data on the display, the unmodified data being unblurred [col. 3, lns. 30-39, wherein switching off the secondary image corresponds to “unmodifying the modified data to form unmodified data”]” supra for claim 1 and [as detailed].

C. Coteus discloses claim 4, “The method recited in claim 3 wherein, in unmodifying, the data is unmodified in accordance with a control signal from a user interface element from the group comprising a cursor position, a pointing device, a key, a button, a screen menu, a screen icon, a microphone; a touch sensitive screen, or a combination thereof [col. 3, lns. 17-39, whereby the switching capability by simply turning off the display generating the secondary image as applied to flat panel display screens, for example active matrix displays, inherently performs switching by at least one of “a cursor position, a pointing device, a key, a button, a screen menu, a screen icon, a microphone, a touch sensitive screen” since all of these are associated with switching means for active matrix displays]” supra for claim 3 and [as detailed].

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

7. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

8. Claim 7 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Coteus as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Aras et al., (US 5,757,417).

A. Coteus discloses claim 7, “The method recited in claim 1 wherein, in modifying, a degree of blur is varied in accordance with a control signal from a user interface element from the group comprising a cursor position, a pointing device, a key, a button, a screen menu, a screen icon, a microphone, a touch sensitive screen, or a combination thereof” *supra* for claim 1.

However, Coteus does not appear to disclose “wherein, in modifying, a degree of blur is varied in accordance with a control signal from a user interface element from the group comprising a cursor position, a pointing device, a key, a button, a screen menu, a screen icon, a microphone, a touch sensitive screen, or a combination thereof”, but Aras does in col. 12, lns. 34-67. Wherein ‘obscuring’ corresponds to “blurring”, ‘subscriber input preferences’ corresponds to “accordance with a control signal from a user interface element from the group comprising a cursor position, a pointing device, a key, a button, a screen menu, a screen icon, a microphone, a touch sensitive screen, or a combination thereof”, and ‘1) obscuring the screened portions using an image transformation such as an S-Transform or Hadamard transform, or 2) freezing the last acceptable frame and presenting as a substitute for the screened portions, or 3)

blanking the display, or 4) substituting an acceptable image or 5) presenting an alternative AVM stream' corresponds to "modifying, a degree of blur".

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply preparing, modifying and displaying data disclosed by Coteus in combination with modifying a degree of blur varied in accordance with a control signal varied from a user interface element disclosed by Aras, and motivated to combine the teachings because both are directed toward limitations of what can be viewed by the user and viewers of the displayed data as revealed by Aras in col. 1, ln. 66 – col. 2, ln. 35.

9. Claims 29-45 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Coteus, *supra* for claim 1.

A. Regarding claims 29-45, Coteus does not teach specific common data attributes such as paragraph line spacing, the group consisting of page number and page type, document name, document type, user name, user location, device name, calendar data, time of day, type of formatting style, group consisting of text data, currency data, and numerical data, a text type selected from the group consisting of a keyword and a character string, a database field, a file name, a spreadsheet cell, a computer-generated graphical image, and wherein the at least one data attribute is selected from the group consisting of color of the image, size of the image, shape of the image, angular orientation of the image, intensity of the image, and position of the image, a computer-processed pre-existing image, and wherein the at least one data attribute is selected from the group consisting of color of the image, size of the image, shape of the image, angular orientation of the image, intensity of the image, and position of the image.

However, such data attributes as broadly claimed are each well known in the prior art and each are capable of being used by Coteus so therefore this recitation is viewed as merely directed towards an "OBVIOUS INTENDED USE" of the data being modified because Coteus must use one of the data attributes sited and one is motivated to use one or the other based on environment and type of data of operation. The fact that so many data attributes are claimed may suggest that the specific data attribute being used to modify the data is not critical to practice of the apparatus.

10. Claims 8-14, 22-28, 46 and 48 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Coteus as applied to claims 1, 3, 4 and 7 above, and further in view of Kobatashi, (US 5,619,285).

A. Coteus discloses claim 8, "A computer including a memory to store data and at least one data attribute, and a user interface including a display, the computer executing a computer program comprising the operations of:

preparing data for display on the display;  
modifying the data to form modified data, if the at least one data attribute specifies that the data should be modified; and  
displaying the modified data on the display, the modified data having reduced legibility but not being illegible to a user of the computer" supra for claim 1.

However, Coteus does not appear to disclose, "displaying the modified data on the display, the modified data having reduced legibility but not being illegible to a user of the computer", but Kobayashi does in col. 1, ln. 65 – col. 2, ln. 10 and col. 2, ln. 47 – col. 3, ln. 2. Wherein setting screen voltage (i.e. different screen resolutions) blurs displayed characters, and CPU corresponds to computer for executing computer program.

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply preparing, modifying and displaying data disclosed by Coteus in combination with setting different screen resolutions disclosed by Kobayashi, and motivated to combine the teachings because it would blur displayed characters as revealed by Kobayashi in col. 2, lines 9-10.

B. Coteus and Kobayashi disclose claim 9, "The computer recited in claim 8, wherein, in modifying, the at least one data attribute is selected from the group consisting of font, paragraph, page, document, user name, user location, device name, date, time, style name, data type, text, field, file name, cell, color, size, shape, angular orientation, intensity, and position" supra for claim 8. Wherein screen resolution corresponds to size.

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply preparing, modifying and displaying data disclosed by Coteus in combination with setting different screen resolution size disclosed by Kobayashi, and motivated to combine the teachings because it would blur displayed characters as revealed by Kobayashi in col. 2, lines 9-10.

C. Coteus and Kobayashi disclose claim 10, "The computer recited in claim 8, wherein the computer program further comprises the operations of:  
unmodifying the modified data to form unmodified data; and  
displaying the unmodified data on the display, the unmodified data being unblurred" supra for claim 8. Wherein setting the screen resolution to an original resolution from the different resolution corresponds to "unmodifying the modified data to form unmodified data; and displaying the unmodified data on the display, the unmodified data being unblurred".

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply preparing, modifying and displaying data disclosed by Coteus in combination with setting the screen resolution to an original resolution from the different resolution inherently disclosed by Kobayashi, and motivated to combine the teachings because it would unblur displayed characters as inherently revealed by Kobayashi in col. 2, lines 9-10.

D. Coteus discloses claim 11, “The computer recited in claim 10 wherein, in unmodifying, the computer program comprises the operation of unmodifying the data in accordance with a control signal from a user interface element from the group comprising a cursor position, a pointing device, a key, a button, a screen menu, a screen icon, a microphone, a touch sensitive screen, or a combination thereof” supra for claim 10.

However, Coteus does not appear to disclose, “unmodifying, the computer program comprises the operation of unmodifying the data in accordance with a control signal from a user interface element from the group comprising a cursor position, a pointing device, a key, a button, a screen menu, a screen icon, a microphone, a touch sensitive screen, or a combination thereof”, but Kobayashi does in col. 5, lns. 34-43. Wherein switches 91a and 91b correspond to “a control signal from a user interface element from a button”.

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply preparing, modifying and displaying data disclosed by Coteus in combination with setting the screen resolution to an original resolution from the different resolution inherently disclosed by Kobayashi using switches 91a and 91b, and motivated to combine the teachings because it would unblur displayed characters as inherently revealed by Kobayashi in col. 2, lines 9-10.

E. Coteus and Kobayashi disclose claim 12, "The computer recited in claim 8 wherein, in displaying, the computer program comprises the operation of blurring the modified data" supra for claim 8. Wherein setting screen voltage (i.e. different screen resolutions) blurs displayed characters, and CPU corresponds to computer for executing computer program.

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply preparing, modifying and displaying data disclosed by Coteus in combination with setting different screen resolutions disclosed by Kobayashi, and motivated to combine the teachings because it would blur displayed characters as revealed by Kobayashi in col. 2, lines 9-10.

F. Coteus discloses claim 13, "The computer recited in claim 9, wherein the computer program, in the modifying operation, varies a degree of blur in accordance with the at least one data attribute" supra for claim 9.

However, Coteus does not appear to disclose, "wherein the computer program, in the modifying operation, varies a degree of blur in accordance with the at least one data attribute", but Kobayashi does in col. 1, lns. 51-55, col. 1, ln. 65 – col. 2, ln. 10 and col. 2, ln. 47 – col. 3, ln. 2. Wherein setting screen voltage (i.e. different screen resolutions) provides for focus adjustment (blur) which blur displayed characters, and CPU corresponds to computer for executing computer program.

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply preparing, modifying and displaying data disclosed by Coteus in combination with setting different screen resolutions (focus adjustment) disclosed by Kobayashi,

and motivated to combine the teachings because it would blur displayed characters as revealed by Kobayashi in col. 2, lines 9-10.

G. Coteus and Kobayashi disclose claim 14, "The computer recited in claim 12 wherein the computer program, in the modifying operation, varies a degree of blur in accordance with a control signal from a user interface element from the group comprising a cursor position, a pointing device, a key, a button, a screen menu, a screen icon, a microphone, a touch sensitive screen, or a combination thereof" supra for claim 12. Wherein setting screen voltage (i.e. different screen resolutions) inherently corresponds to different levels of blurred displayed characters, and CPU corresponds to computer for executing computer program.

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply preparing, modifying and displaying data disclosed by Coteus in combination with setting different screen resolutions inherently corresponding to different levels of blurred displayed characters disclosed by Kobayashi, and motivated to combine the teachings because it would blur displayed characters as revealed by Kobayashi in col. 2, lines 9-10.

H. Per claims 22-28, these are directed to an article comprising a machine-accessible medium having associated instructions, for the computer of claims 8-14, and therefore are rejected to claims 8-14.

J. Per claims 46 and 48, these are directed to a method for performing the method of claims 1 and 29 and the computer of claim 8, and therefore are rejected to claims 1, 8 and 29.

11. Claims 15-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Coteus as applied to claims 1, 3, 4 and 7 above, further in view of Kobatashi, (US 5,619,285) and further in view of Official Notice.

A. Per claims 15-21, these are directed to a network for the computer of claims 8-14, and therefore are rejected to claims 8-14.

However, claims 8-14 do not appear to disclose computer network and a remote computing device, but Official notice is taken that the art is replete with network administration for setting parameters at remote stations (networked computers) comprising, *inter alia*, screen resolution.

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply the elements of claims 8-14 disclosed by Coteus and Kobayashi in combination with computer network disclosed by Official Notice, and motivated to combine the teachings because it would provide access as revealed by Official Notice for network administration.

*Response to Arguments*

12. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1, 3, 4, 7-46 and 48 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

*Responses*

13. Responses to this action should be mailed to: Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks, Washington, D.C. 20231.

*Inquiries*

14. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Gregory F. Cunningham whose telephone number is (571) 272-7784.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Richard Hjerpe can be reached on (571) 272-7691. The Central FAX Number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is **571-273-8300**.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

*G.F. Cunningham*

Gregory F. Cunningham  
Examiner  
Art Unit 2676

gfc

2/15/2006



RICHARD HJERPE  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600